



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ON THE USE OF THE PERFECT INFINITIVE IN LATIN WITH THE FORCE OF THE PRESENT.

BY ALBERT A. HOWARD.

THE frequent use of the perfect active infinitive in Latin, in sentences where the force and meaning of the present infinitive seem rather to be called for, has long been a vexed question among grammarians. Briefly stated, the following classes of cases occur : —

In the older language, *viz.* in inscriptions and early writers, the perfect infinitive is often thus found depending on some form of the verb *nolo* or of *uolo* in connection with a negative, e.g. *nolito deuellisse*, *nequis uelit hoc fecisse*, in all of which cases a strong prohibition is contained.

In later writers, and especially in the poets, this use is extended to clauses not prohibitive, but in which the infinitive is dependent in like manner on the verb *nolo* or *uolo*, e.g. *nil uetitum fecisse uolet*.

In poetry, again, the perfect infinitive with the force of the present is joined with the present tense of the verb *possum*, and Servius ad Aen. VI. 79, says of this use, “Attica figura est.”

There are many other instances, chiefly in the works of the elegiac poets, of the perfect infinitive with the force of the present, which, as they are to be considered later on, need only be mentioned in this introduction.

Induced by these occurrences and by the explanation of Servius, some grammarians have compared this use of the perfect infinitive in Latin with that of the aorist infinitive in Greek, and have attempted in this way to explain all the peculiarities of the perfect infinitive ; while others, denying that the notion of the aorist has any existence in Latin, explain these uses in various ways.

Without examining and refuting any of the false ideas which have been brought forward on this subject, it will be sufficient to state that hardly any use of the perfect infinitive has not by some one been explained as an aorist.

Madvig has treated this subject in his *Opuscula Academica*, vol. II. pp. 119-129, denying the existence of an aorist in the Latin language; Wex, in his prolegomena to Tac. Agric. pp. 148-157, recognizes and defends the aorist. Haase and Holtze have also treated the matter, as well as some others whose names are omitted because they have brought forward no new material or have simply expressed opinions without investigating the matter at length.

It is generally admitted that the later use of the perfect infinitive in elegiac poetry had its origin in the old legal formulae with verbs of wishing, *uolo*, *nolo*, etc.

Let us then first inspect these formulae out of which the later use is said to have been developed.

In the S. C. de Bacchanalibus the following forms occur: —

De bacanalibus quei foideratei esent ita exdeicendum censuere.

I *Neiquis* eorum bacanal *habuisse uolet*.

II Bacas uir *nequis adiese uolet* . . . nisei praetorem urbanum adiesent isque de senatuos sententiad, . . . iousiset.

III *Neue* pecuniam quisquam eorum comoinem *habuisse uolet*; *neue* magistratum . . . quiquam *fecisse uolet*; *neue* posthac inter sed *coniourasse neue* *conuouisse neue* *conspondisse neue* *conpromesisse uolet*, *neue* quisquam fidem inter sed *dedisse uolet*.

IV Sacra in oquoltod *ne* quisquam *fecisse uolet*; *neue* in poplicod *neue* in preiuatod *neue* exstrad urbem sacra quisquam *fecisse uolet* nisei praetorem urbanum adieset, isque . . . iousiset.

V Homines plous V oinuorsei . . . sacra *ne* quisquam *fecisse uolet*, *neue* . . . *arfuisse uelent*, nisei de praetoris . . . sententiad.

In II, IV, and V, provision is made that if any one thinks it necessary to celebrate the rites, he may do so, provided that before any step *shall have been* taken by the celebrater he approach the praetor and obtain his order to proceed with the rites. Cf. Liv. XXXIX. 18, 8: si quis tale sacrum sollemne et necessarium duceret nec sine religione et piaculo se id dimittere posse, apud praetorem urbanum profiteretur, praetor senatum consuleret. si ei permissum esset cum in senatu centum non minus essent, ita id sacrum faceret, etc.

All these examples seem to have the exact force of the future perfect, and to imply the absolute fulfilment of one act before another begins; therefore an investigation of the uses of the future perfect in Latin will not be out of place at this point.

The older writers often in treating of a future event conceived of it as completed at some future time, and expressed this conception by the future perfect tense.<sup>1</sup> The Latin use of the future perfect was much more exact than our own use of this tense, or even than that of the Greeks,<sup>2</sup> but for that very reason, in striving to be exact, they often went too far, and transferred this use of the future perfect to sentences where the simple future would have been more correctly used. Draeger, I. pp. 284-5, has collected a large number of examples illustrating this point; cf. Madvig, Opusc. Acad. II. p. 93.

The Latin language is deficient in tenses of completed action for the imperative, and so, if one wished to express a prohibition or command, having in mind the future perfect, *i.e.* the accomplishment of the thing ordered, a circumlocution was necessary. Such circumlocutions may be seen in Cato de Agric. V. 6, boues maxima diligentia curatos habeto; Plaut. Poen. 1157, pactam rem habeto. Priscian (ed. Hertz), p. 406, says: "apud Graecos etiam praeteriti temporis sunt imperatiua, quamuis ipsa quoque ad futuri temporis sensum pertineant, ut, ἡνεώχθω ἡ πύλη, 'aperta sit porta'; uidemur enim imperare, ut in futuro tempore sit praeteritum, ut si dicam 'aperi nunc portam, ut crastino sit aperta.' ergo nos quoque possumus in passiuis uel in aliis passiuam declinationem habentibus uti praeterito tempore imperatiui, coniungentes participium praeteriti cum uerbo imperatiuo praesentis uel futuri temporis, ut 'amatus sit' uel 'esto' πεφιλῆσθω, 'doctus sit' uel 'esto' δεδιδάχθω, 'clausus sit' uel 'esto' κεκλείσθω." In this way is to be explained the use of the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions, for there is in this use the force of a future perfect which gradually develops into a future, as Madvig<sup>3</sup> has clearly shown.

There are, further, strong indications that the perfect infinitive joined with the verb *uolo* expresses the idea of the future perfect. With verbs which in themselves have a future significance, the present infinitive seems often to have the force of a future. Verbs of wishing, *uolo*, etc., can be shown by many examples to be joined with the present infinitive with future significance, exactly as *spero* is often

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, hist. Syntax I. p. 284. Holtze, Synt. prisc. script. Rom. II. pp. 86-88. Zumpt, Lat. Gram. § 590.

<sup>2</sup> Goodwin, M. and T. p. 45, remark.

<sup>3</sup> Opusc. Acad. II. p. 105; cf. Ed. Loch, Imperativ bei Plautus, p. 21.

thus joined. In the following examples there can be no doubt of the future significance: "is *dare uolt*, is se aliquid *posci*." "res quaedam est, quam *uolo* ego me a te *exorare*." "qui populares se *esse uolunt*." Very often, too, the perfect passive infinitive or the participle alone is joined with a verb of wishing, and here there are many instances pointing clearly to the sense of a future perfect. Cic. Caecil. 6, 21: tamen eos defendes, qui se ab omnibus *desertos* potius quam abs te *defensos esse malunt*, and a little further on, cur te interponis inuitissimis his, quibus maxime lex *consultum esse uolt*? Cic. Rosc. Am. 9, 25: orent ut et illius mortui famam et filii innocentis fortunas *conseruatas uelit*. Cic. Verr. III. 4, 7: ingenium uero et uirtutem *depressam exstinctamque cupitis*. Cic. Cael. 3, 8: illud tamen te *esse admonitum uolo*. Plaut. Amph. 33: iustam rem et facilem *esse oratam* a uobis *uolo*.

In general all examples of the perfect *passive* infinitive, with verbs of wishing, admit of this explanation.

Later writers, and especially Livy, transferred this use to the perfect *active* infinitive, —

Liv. XXIV. 16. 11: tum Gracchus 'priusquam omnes iure libertas aequasset,' inquit 'neminem nota strenui aut ignaui militis *notasse uolui*.'

where, if Livy has retained the exact words of Gracchus, this use must be regarded as much older than has been stated above. But a little before (§ 9) he said, omnes *malle laudatos* a se dignos indignosque, quam quemquam eo die *castigatum esse*, and in the same way he might in this case have said, neminem *notatum uolui*, —

Liv. XXXII. 21. 32: quia *pepercisse* uobis *uolunt*, committere uos cur pereatis non patiuntur, *i.e.* quia uos *conseruatos esse uolunt*.

Liv. XLII. 11. 1: plurium annales, et quibus *credidisse malis*, ipsum Eumenem uenisse tradunt, *i.e.* quibus *creditum esse malis*.

Hor. A. P. 347: sunt delicta tamen quibus *ignouisse uelimus*,

which might also be expressed quibus *ignotum uelimus*.

There are many other examples which, although they are not distinctly derived from this use, have the same force of the future perfect, e.g. —

Tib. III. 5. 31: uiuite felices memores et uiuite nostri,  
siue erimus seu nos fata *fuisse uelint*,

where the idea of *fata fuisse uelim* may be expressed more simply by the future perfect "seu fuerimus."

Ov. ex P. III. 1. 9: pace tua *dixisse uelim*.

Cf. Cic. pro Mil. 103: pace tua patria *dixerim*, where both *dixisse uelim* and *dixerim* have the force of the future perfect.

The view of this construction taken by Perizonius<sup>1</sup> is well worthy of notice. Sanctius had said that the perfect infinitive was used for the future in these expressions, but Perizonius denied that the idea of futurity was expressed by the infinitive. His words are: "Infinitivus iunctus uerbo *uolo* notat simpliciter ipsam cuiuscunque rei actionem, quae futuri temporis forma non exprimitur. Nam quis unquam dixit aut scripsit *uolo hoc facturum esse*, siue *me*, siue *te*, siue illum? si quid futuri in hac inest locutione, id haeret in ipso uerbo *uolo*, quod suam certae actionis uoluntatem extendit a praesenti temporis momento usque in illud, quo ea actio tandem fit, aut desiderata res sibi obuenit: — Deinde sola hac perfecti temporis forma uidetur aliqua certe temporis distinctio plerumque notari. Nam *uolo te emisse* notat, non, uolo te uelle et incipere emptionem, sed te eam mihi factam et absolutam praestare." This is equivalent to saying that, since there is the force of the future perfect in the phrase *uolo te emisse*, the idea of the future is contained in the verb *uolo*, that of the completed action in the perfect infinitive.

Wex also holds this same opinion of certain examples (p. 154): "perfectum ad iudicium spectat, quod ubi res confecta erit, aut ipse qui rem agit, aut alii, qui de ea re iudicabunt, facient," and as examples he quotes Liv. XLII. 11. 1: plurium annales et quibus *credidisse malis* (see above p. 114), and Sall. Jug. 31. 27: neque ego uos hortor, ut *malitis* ciues uestros perperam quam recte *fecisse*.

Still another indication is the similar use of the perfect subjunctive after verbs of wishing, and notably in the following examples, all from early writers, and all showing clearly the force of the future perfect. Ter. Ad. 519: ita se *defetigarit uelim* ut triduo hoc perpetuo prorsum e lecto nequeat surgere. Plaut. Poen. 1206: *uelim* de me aliquid *dixerit*. Plaut. Poen. 570: Quin etiam *deciderint* femina uobis in talos *uelim*. Plaut. Rud. 662: nimis *uelim* improbissumo homini malas *edentauerint*.

<sup>1</sup> Ad Sanctii Mineruae pag. 112.

To return now to the forms of prohibition in which the perfect infinitive is joined with the verb *uolo*, Ovid, in the only case in which he uses this form, has joined it so closely with the future perfect that there can be no doubt as to his understanding of the construction ;

Ov. Am. I. 4. 38 :

oscula praecipue nulla *dedisse uelis*.  
oscula *si dederis*, fiam manifestus amator.

for the future perfect in verse 39 is simply the idea of verse 38 in conditional form, and it might have been expressed *si uoles dedisse*. In Plautus there is another similar indication ; Poen. 872 : —

*nolito* edepol *deuellisse* : iam his duobus mensibus  
uolucres alae tibi erunt hirquinae ;

where the future<sup>1</sup> imperative contains the idea of futurity, the perfect infinitive the idea of the completed action ; and in this clause also the words *nolito deuellisse* imply a protasis, *si non deuelleris*, as in the example quoted from Ovid.

The other instances of this use, in all of which the force of the future perfect can be seen, are as follows : —

Cato de Agr. V. 4: *nequid emisse uelit* insciente domino, *nequid* dominum *celauisse uelit* . . . Chaldaeum *nequem consuluisse uelit*.

Varro ap. Non. p. 394: *nequis* lictorem spurcum hominem liberumprehendere *iussisse uelit*.

Gell. XIII. 15. 1: ex uetere forma perpetua . . . *nequis* magistratus minor de caelo *seruasse uelit*.

Ter. Hec. 560: interdico *ne extulisse* extra aedes puerum usquam *uelis*.

C. Gracchus ap. Gell. X. 3. 3: Caleni ubi id audierunt, edixerunt, *nequis* in balneis *lauisse uellet*, cum magistratus Romanus ibi esset.

Hauboldii monum. legal. p. 178: *neue* cretulentum *exegisse uelit* nisi in duabus lacunis prius emet.

Liv. XXXIX. 14. 8 (de senatus consulto): iubent . . . edicta mitti, *nequis* qui Bacchis initiatus esset, *coisse* aut *conuenisse* sacrorum causa *uelit* *ne* quid talis rei diuinae *fecisse*.

Liv. XXXIX. 17. 3: edixerunt deinde, *nequis* quid fugae causa *uendisse* *neue* *emisse uellet*.

<sup>1</sup> Loch, Imperativ bei Plautus, p. 6, n.

Liv. XXXVIII. 11. 9: *nequem* eorum Aetoli *recepisse uelint*.

Hor. Sat. II. 3. 187: *nequis humasse uelit* Aiace, Atrida, uetas cur?

From these prohibitions must be separated a few other phrases in which the perfect infinitive is joined with a verb of wishing. There are in Latin, as in Greek, certain verbs, the perfect tense of which, since it expresses the state in which the subject is after the action of the verb has been completed, has the force of the present tense of another verb by which that state is represented.<sup>1</sup> In this way the perfect *perii* is found in writers of all periods with the meaning *mortuus sum*, and *uici* with the meaning *uictor sum*. It is not surprising then to find, even in Cicero, this use transferred to the perfect infinitive; e.g.:—

Verr. II. 149: nemo eorum est qui non *perisse* te cupiat.

Verr. III. 180: uide, quaere, circumspice, siquis est forte ex ea prouincia, . . . qui te nolit *perisse*.

Rosc. Am. 73: esto: causam proferre non potes: tametsi statim *uicisse* debeo, tamen de meo iure decedam,

where, better to express the force of the present in *uicisse*, the temporal adverb *statim* is added, the idea being *statim uictor esse debeo*. Further examples are:—

Liv. XL. 10. 5: Non Romanos, habeo ad quos confugiam: *perisse* expetunt, quia tuis iniuriis doleo.

Enn. ap. Cic. de Off. II. 23: quem quisque odit, *periisse* expetit.

Lucil. (ed. Müll.) V. 11: ut *periisse* uelis quem uisere uolueris cum debueris.

Ov. Am. II. 2. 10: . . . quem metuit quisque, *perisse* cupit.

Ov. Am. II. 19. 56: nil facies cur te iure *perisse* uelim?

Ov. Met. XIV. 570: nec sceptrum soceri, nec te, Launia uirgo, sed *uicisse* petunt.

It will be sufficient to quote, without discussion, the examples in which Wex, the strongest partisan of the aorist theory, and others have admitted a legitimate use of the perfect. In the following examples, all of which have been explained at one time or another as illustrating the use of the perfect as an aorist, it is easy to see that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Wex, prol. ad Tac. Agr. pp. 149, 150.



perfect represents the condition or state after the action of the verb has been completed, and they are so explained by Wex, —

Lucr. III. 69: unde homines dum se falso terrore coacti  
*effugisse uolunt* longe longeque *remosse*.

Ov. Rem. Am. 735: Argolides *cuperent fugisse* Capharea puppes.

Tac. Dial. or. 24: tuum tamen, Messala, promissum *immutasse* non debes; *i.e.* immutata mente stare-debes.

Corn. Nep., Eum. 9: quod diebus quinque hostis *transisse* potest.

Liv. XXXVII. 19. 5: instauremus nouum de integro bellum, quod possumus . . . ante hiemem, diis uolentibus *perfecisse*.

There are some instances, especially in poetry, where with verbs of wishing the perfect infinitive has its proper significance of an action in past time with respect to the time of the leading verb; as, —

Tib. I. 6. 73: non ego te pulsare uelim, sed, uenerit iste  
si furor, *optarim* non *habuisse* manus.

Ov. Met. VII. 712: Procrin habe! dixit. quodsi mea prouida mens est,  
non *habuisse* uoles.

Ov. Met. X. 220: at si forte roges fecundam Amathunta metallis  
an *genuisse uelit* Propoetidas, etc.

Mart. X. 48. 21: accedent sine felle ioci nec mane timenda  
libertas et nil quod *tacuisse uelis*.

Liv. XXII. 59. 10: haud equidem ullius ciuis et commilitonis fortunae aut condicioni inuideo, nec premendo alium me *extulisse uelim*; ne illi quidem, nisi pernicitatis pedum et cursus aliquod praemium est, . . . se nobis merito praetulerint gloriatique sint in se plus quam in nobismet praesidii rei publicae esse.

With these words M. Junius chides his fellow soldiers who had fled after the battle of Cannae, and, comparing his own course with theirs, he says ironically: "I shouldn't like to have exalted myself by crushing another (*i.e.* at the expense of a fellow soldier), as they have done, for they have claimed superiority over us, and have boasted that the safety of the state was dependent more on them than on us."

By far the largest number of examples however have the future perfect significance; but as the line of demarcation between the

future and the future perfect was so loosely drawn, the distinction between future and future perfect (*i.e.* present and perfect infinitive) in this use is very slight indeed. Compare what has been said above (p. 113) about the future perfect.

The following examples, drawn mostly from the poets, seem to have retained the force of the future perfect : —

Liv. XXX. 14. 6: hanc te quoque ad ceteras tuas eximias uirtutes, Masinissa, *adiecisse uelim*.

Hor. Ep. II. 2. 109: at qui legitimum *cupiet fecisse* poema,  
cum tabulis animum censoris sumet honesti.

Tib. I. 6. 63: proprios ego tecum,  
sit modo fas, annos *contribuisse uelim*.

Tib. IV. 6. 6: est tamen, occulte cui *placuisse uelit*.

Prop. I. 7. 15: te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu  
quo *nolim* nostros te *uiolasse* deos.

Ov. Ar. Am. II. 609: condita si non sunt Veneris mysteria cistis, . . .  
attamen inter nos medio uersantur in usu,  
sed sic, inter nos ut *latuisse uelint*.

Ov. Met. VII. 59: quemque ego cum rebus, quas totus possidet orbis,  
Aesonidem *mutasse uelim*.

Ov. Fas. VI. 71: remque mei iuris *malim tenuisse* precando.

Juv. XIV. 185: nil uetitum *fecisse uolet*.

Pers. I. 41: . . . an erit, qui *uelle* recuset  
os populi *meruisse*?

Pers. I. 91: plorabit, qui me *uolet incuruasse* querela.

Mart. VI. 29. 8: quidquid amas, *cupias non placuisse* nimis.

Mart. IX. 81. 3: non nimium curo; nam cenae fercula nostrae  
*malim* conuiuiis quam *placuisse* cocis.

In these last examples it is hard to distinguish whether the force is more nearly that of the future or of the future perfect. In the following cases the force of the future perfect has entirely given way to that of the future.

Ov. Am. II. 16. 13: non ego, si medio Polluce et Castore ponar,  
in caeli sine te parte *fuisse uelim*.

Ov. Am. II. 17. 29: noui aliquam, quae se circumferat esse Corinnam.  
ut fiat, quid non illa *dedisse uelit*?

Ov. Am. II. 4. 25: haec quia dulce canit, flectitque facillima uocem,  
oscula cantanti rapta *dedisse uelim*.

Hor. Sat. I. 2. 28: sunt qui *nolint tetigisse*.

This easy transition of meaning from future perfect to future may have influenced the poets, and especially the elegiac poets, to use the perfect infinitive in order to avoid metrical difficulties. The perfect infinitive once accepted in this use with verbs of wishing and with others in which there was a future significance, the transition to a similar use of the perfect for the present, with verbs in which there was no future significance, would be a very easy one, and the desire to avoid certain metrical difficulties would be a very strong one. Out of 120 cases in Ovid in which the perfect infinitive is used where the present was to be expected, 86 occur in pentameter, and in Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Martial, the percentage is still greater. In all of these cases the infinitive immediately precedes the iambic word with which the verse ends. As the artificial character of the pentameter admitted no substitutions in the last half of the verse, and required an iambic word at the end, there was developed a strong tendency in Latin to make the last half of the verse consist of two words, one pentasyllabic and the other disyllabic; e.g. *luxuriantur opes, implicuisse uelit*, etc. The following table shows in column I. the number of pentameter verses, in column II. the number of these verses in which the pentasyllabic word, including words joined to the enclitics *-que* and *-ue*, occurs, and in column III. the number of these verses in which the pentasyllabic word is a perfect infinitive:—

|                                       | I.   | II. | III. |
|---------------------------------------|------|-----|------|
| Catullus . . . . .                    | 318  | 15  | 4    |
| Tibullus . . . . .                    | 854  | 104 | 44   |
| Propertius . . . . .                  | 2048 | 58  | 16   |
| Ovid, Amores . . . . .                | 1230 | 122 | 33   |
| Heroides . . . . .                    | 1868 | 192 | 44   |
| Med. fac., Ars Am., and Rem. Am.      | 1622 | 167 | 33   |
| Trist., ex Pont., Ibis, and Fasti .   | 6154 | 805 | 111  |
| Martial, excl. Xenia and Apophoreta . | 2938 | 288 | 16   |
| Xenia and Apophoreta . . . .          | 359  | 17  | 1    |

Of these infinitives, the following are noteworthy : —

**A.**

|              |               |              |               |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| abstinuisse  | delituisset   | erubuisset   | perdomuisset  |
| admonuisset  | demeruisset   | execuisset   | permaduisset  |
| adplicuisset | desiluisset   | explicuisset | pertimuisset  |
| commeruisset | detinuisset   | incaluisset  | praesequisset |
| condoluisset | dimicuisset   | increpuisset | secubuisset   |
| dedoluisset  | displicuisset | intonuisset  | subsequisset  |
| defricuisset | emeruisset    | obticuisset  | sustinuisset  |

\* adsedisisset

---

|           |               |            |               |
|-----------|---------------|------------|---------------|
| metuisset | prostituisset | tribuisset | substituisset |
|           | restituisset  |            |               |

The present infinitive of these verbs contains either a cretic or a proceleusmatic, and so cannot be used either in hexameter or pentameter.

**B.**

|              |             |             |               |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| conseruisset | deseruisset | excoluisset | inseruisset   |
| consuluisset | eripuisset  | exeruisset  | propripuisset |

---

|             |            |             |            |
|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| aduexisset  | coluisset  | excussisset | legisset   |
| cecinnisset | effugisset | fecisset    | peperisset |
| collegisset | excepisset | fugisset    | texisset   |

The present infinitive of these verbs contains a tribrach, and can only be used in elegiac poetry when the last syllable is elided.

**C.**

|              |             |              |              |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| composuisset | euoluisset  | obposuisset  | proposuisset |
| concubuisset | edidicisset | occubuisset  | subposuisset |
| disposuisset | inposuisset | procubuisset | succubuisset |

The present infinitive of these verbs, on account of the spondee which it contains, cannot stand in the last half of a pentameter, but this is the place in which all the perfect infinitives are found.

On account of metrical difficulties the perfect infinitive is found with verbs of wishing as follows : —

- Cat. 69. 1 : noli admirari, quare tibi femina nulla,  
 [C] Rufe, *uelit* tenerum *subposuisse* femur.

- Tib. I. 4. 55:           rapta dabit primo, mox offeret ipse roganti,  
                           [A]       post etiam collo se *implicuisse* uolet.
- Ov. Am. II. 4. 22: est etiam, quae me uatem et mea carmina culpet;  
                           [A]       culpantis *cupiam sustinuisse* femur.
- Ov. Am. III. 2. 29: talia Milanion Atalantes crura fugacis  
                           [A]       *optauit* manibus *sustinuisse* suis.
- Ov. Her. III. 110 [B]: . . . fallentem *deseruisse* uelis.
- Ov. Ar. Am. I. 293: illum Gnossiaesque Cydoneaeque iuuencae  
                           [A]       *optarunt* tergo *sustinuisse* suo.
- Mart. IV. 31. 3:       ne ualeam, si non res est gratissima nobis  
                           [B]       et *uolo* te chartis *inseruisse* meis.
- Mart. IX. 39. 1:       prima Palatino lux est haec orta Tonanti,  
                           [B]       *optasset* Cybele qua *peperisse* Iouem.

To these verbs may be added a number of others in which the idea of wishing is contained, *viz.* those called by Draeger, II. 306, "Verba der Willensrichtung," and by Merguet (*de usu syntactico infinitiui maxime poetico*, p. 18), "uerba uoluntatis." On account of the idea of wishing which they contain, they are frequently joined with the infinitive, and since verbs of wishing contain also the idea of futurity, the present infinitive in this construction has often the force of the future, the perfect infinitive the force of the future perfect. The examples are all found in the poets, and in many cases the perfect seems to have been used to avoid metrical difficulties.

These verbs are, —

*probo.*

- Ov. Ar. Am. III. 215: nec coram mixtas ceruae *sumpsisse* medullas,  
                           [A]       nec coram dentes *defricuisse* *proben*.

Here *sumpsisse* is not used for metrical reasons, but is possibly to be explained as influenced by *defricuisse*.

*amo.*

- Hor. Sat. I. 10. 60:                           *amet scripsisse* ducentos  
   ante cibum uersus.

*audeo.*

- Ov. Tr. I. 5. 4. [A]: *ausus es* adloquio *sustinuisse* tuo.





the auxiliary verb that completed state of action which has already been expressed by the perfect participle, he says that a similar feeling led to the use of *oportuit*, etc. with the perfect infinitive, e.g. Ter. And. 239 : *nonne oportuit praescisse* me ante, instead of *praescire* ; and so also with the perfect passive participle, which often takes the place of the passive infinitive ; as, Ter. And. 239 : *nonne prius communicatum oportuit* ; Haut. 536 : *haec facta ab illo oportebat*.

This construction is common in poetry, where it is often due to a desire to avoid metrical difficulties.

- Verg. Aen. X. 94 [A] : *tum decuit metuisse* tuis,  
 Tib. III. 6. 63 [A] : *debueram . . . implicuisse*,  
 Ov. Her. II. 28 [A] : *potui demeruisse*  
 Ov. Her. XI. 109 : *si potuit meruisse* necem meruisse putetur ;  
 Ov. Her. XII. 4 : *debuerant . . . euoluisse*  
 Ov. Her. XII. 164 [A] : *non potui . . . perdomuisse*  
 Ov. Rem. Am. 112 [A] : *debuerat praesequuisse*  
 Ov. Rem. Am. 574 [A] : *debueras . . . substituisse*  
 Ov. Rem. Am. 763 [B] : *carmina quis potuit tuto legisse* Tibulli  
 Ov. Trist. III. 13. 4 [C] : *debueras . . . imposuisse*  
 Ov. Trist. V. 3. 16 [A] : *debueras . . . sustinuisse*  
 Ov. Ib. 348 [A] : *qua potuit . . . erubuisse*  
 Ov. Fas. I. 354 [A] : *debueras . . . abstinuisse*  
 Ov. Fas. III. 480 [A] : *potui dedoluisse*  
 Mart. 15. 6 : *Herculeas potuit* qui *decuisset* manus  
 Mart. VII. 21. 4 : *debuisset* hoc saltem non *licuisse* tibi  
 Mart. IX. 28. 2 : *ille ego sum . . .*  
 [B] *qui spectatorem potui fecisse* Catonem,  
*soluere* qui Curios Fabriciosque graues.

With the *present* tense of *possum* the perfect infinitive is found once in Plautus where the present infinitive was to be expected,—

Aul. 828 : *non potes probasse* nugas.

With the exception of a single possible example in Livy, I have not found this construction in any classical prose writer, where it cannot



be explained by assuming that the perfect denotes a state or condition which can be expressed by the present tense of another verb, as has been explained on page 117.

The passage in Plautus clearly contains the force of a future perfect. Strobilus, through fear of not obtaining his freedom, represents that he has been jesting in saying that he has found the treasure-box, and Lyconides replies, "non *potes probasse* nugas," "you will never make me believe it was a joke."

Verg. Aen. VI. 79: *bacchatur uates magnum si pectore possit*  
[B] *excussisse* deum.

Cf. Servius: "excussisse uero deum pro 'excutere,' tempus est pro tempore. est autem Attica figura, qua nos uti non conuenit, quia hac licenter utuntur poetae." This is the only instance of the construction in Vergil, and as the metre will not allow *excutere* unless the last syllable is elided, it is very probable that the poet treated the verb *possum* as referring to the future, like the *uerba uoluntatis*, and used the perfect infinitive, regarding the construction as a future perfect.

The other instances of this use show, almost without exception, the use of *possum* with reference to the future as in the two examples just quoted, and the perfect infinitives are used for metrical reasons.

Ov. Am. III. 2. 63: *potes*, si forte iuuabit,  
[B] *cancellis primos inseruisse* pedes.

Ov. Ar. Am. II. 583 [B]: non uultus *texisse* suos, non denique *possunt*  
[C] *partibus obscenis obposuisse* manus.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 333 [B]: et teneri *possis* carmen *legisse* Properti.

Ov. Met. II. 564: mea poena uolucres  
[A] *admonuisse potest*, ne uoce pericula quaerant.

Ov. Met. V. 225 [A]: et *possum tribuisse* et magnum est munus inerti.

Ov. Tr. IV. 2. 2 [C]: uicta *potes flexo succubuisse* genu.

Ov. Tr. V. 3. 32 [A]: admonitu matris *condoluisse potes*  
et *potes . . . dicere*.

Ov. ex P. III. 4. 30 [A]: ingenium quoduis *incaluisse potest*.

Ov. ex P. III. 4. 59: dum uenit huc rumor, properataque carmina fiunt,  
factaque sunt ad uos, annus *abisse potest*.



Liv. XLIV. 22. 8: in omnibus circulis . . . sunt qui . . . sciant . . . quando cum hoste manus conserendae, quando *quiesse sit melius*.

Liv. XLIV. 36. 13: non operaest stanti nunc in acie docere quibus de causis hodie *quiesse melius sit*.

Ter. Ad. 180: ante aedes non *fecisse erit melius* hic conuicium.

In writers of republican times, the phrase *esse melius* is always joined with the infinitive, but a passage in Ulpian, dig. 42. 1. 15, *melius erit* si se non interponant, furnishes the clew to all these infinitives; they have simply the force of conditional clauses (protases), and with *melius erit* the perfect infinitive has the force of a future perfect; with *melius fuit* that of the pluperfect subjunctive, as is clear from the following examples where *dedisse*, *tetigisse*, and *perisse* represent conditions contrary to a fact:—

Ov. Her. XVI. 169: quae iuuat, ut nunc est, eadem mihi gloria damno est, et *melius* famae uerba *dedisse fuit*.

Ov. ex P. III. 7. 25: curando fieri quaedam maiora uidemus uulnera, quae *melius* non *tetigisse fuit*.

Cic. Att. XIV. 10. 2: *melius fuit perisse* illo interfecto, quod utinam accidisset!

In regard to the perfect infinitive with the expressions *satis est*, *satis habeo*, *contentus sum*, etc., there is a general agreement among grammarians that the perfect is always used in its proper sense, denoting an action already completed.<sup>1</sup>

The perfect infinitive with its regular force is, in classical prose writers of every age, made to depend on the verb *iuuo*, and takes the place of a causal clause.

Liv. XXXI. 1: me quoque *iuuat*, uelut ipse in parte laboris ac periculi fuerim, ad finem belli Punici *peruenisse*.

Liv. Praef. 3: utcumque erit, *iuuabit* tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populi pro uirili parte et ipsum *consuluisse*.

The poets at first seem to have used the perfect infinitive with *iuuo* in its proper sense, but in course of time they came to use present

<sup>1</sup> Zumpt, Lat. Gram. § 590. Madvig, Opusc. Acad. II. p. 119. Draeger, hist. Syntax I. § 128. Wex, prol. p. 153.

and perfect without any distinction, being often induced to do so by metrical difficulties.

The following examples show a logical use of the perfect : —

Verg. Georg. III. 525 : quid labor aut benefacta *iuuant*? quid uomere terras  
*inuertisse* graues?

Verg. Aen. III. 282 : *iuuat euasisse* tot urbes  
Argolicas mediosque fugam *tenuisse* per hostes.

Tib. Sulp. VII. 9 : sed *peccasse iuuat*.

Hor. Od. I. 1. 4 : *collegisse iuuat*.

Prop. IV. 4. 19 : me *iuuat* in prima *coluisse* Heliconae iuuenta  
musarumque choris *implicuisse* manus.

Ov. Am. III. 6. 9 : quid *properasse iuuat*, quid parca *dedisse* quieti  
tempora, quid nocti *conseruisse* diem?

Ov. Fas. III. 696 : et *iuuat* hanc magno uerba dedisse deo.

Mart. XII. 84. 1 : uolueram, Polytime, tuos uiolare capillos,  
sed *iuuat* hoc precibus me *tribuisse* tuis.

The following examples have future perfect force : —

Verg. Aen. II. 586 : animumque *explesse iuuabit*  
ultricies flammae et cineres *satiasse* meorum.

Verg. Aen. III. 606 : si pereo, hominum manibus *periisse iuuabit*.

Ov. Ar. Am. I. 428 : littera poscetur . . . ne *didicisse iuuat*.

Ov. Fas. V. 689 : da modo lucra mihi, da facto gaudia lucro,  
et face, ut emptori uerba *dedisse iuuat*.

In the following examples the perfect infinitive seems to have been used solely for metrical convenience, since it is in each case closely associated with a present infinitive in the same construction : —

Tib. I. 1. 45 : quam *iuuat* inmites uentos *audire* cubantem  
[A] et dominam tenero *detinuisse* sinu  
aut . . . *sequi*.

Tib. I. 1. 73 : nunc leuis est tractanda Venus, dum *frangere* postes  
[B] non pudet et rixas *conseruisse iuuat*.

Ov. Her. IV. 87 : quid *iuuat* incinctae studia *exercere* Dianae  
[B] et Veneri numeros *eripuisse* suos?

Mart. VII. 93. 3: quid tam saepe meum nobis *abducere* Quintum  
[A] te iuuat et lenta *detinuisse* mora?

In the following examples the perfect infinitive is used for the present, perhaps from analogy with the preceding examples:—

Ov. Am. I. 13. 5: nunc *iuuat* in teneris dominae *iacuisse* lacertis.

Ov. Ar. Am. I. 405: siue dies suberit natalis, siue Kalendae,  
quas Venerem Marti *continuassee iuuat*.

In this same way the perfect infinitive with its proper force, denoting the cause, is joined in poetry with the verb *gaudeo*. There are no instances of this use in prose before the time of Seneca (cf. Draeger, II. p. 346). The examples in poetry are as follows:—

Hor. Od. I. 34. 16: hic *posuisse gaudet*

Hor. Od. III. 18. 15: *gaudet . . . pepulisse*

Juv. Sat. VIII. 226: *gaudens . . . meruisse*

Juv. Sat. XIV. 270: qui *gaudes . . . aduexisse*

*Pudere, pudor esse, rubor esse.* Prose writers of all periods used with these expressions the perfect infinitive to denote the cause of the *pudor*, always using the perfect in its proper sense,<sup>1</sup> so that no one would ever have dreamed of an aorist use, unless he had examined the poetical constructions.

The poets always use the present and perfect *pudet* and *puduit* with the perfect infinitive in its proper sense of completed action.

Plaut. Pseud. 282: *non dedisse* istunc *pudet*: me, quia non accepi, piget.

Plaut. Most. 1165: si hoc *pudet fecisse* sumptum, supplici iam habeo  
satis.

Tib. I. 9. 29: haec ego dicebam; nunc me *fleuisse* loquentem,  
nunc *pudet* ad teneros *procubuisse* pedes.

Prop. III. 7. 22: uiderit haec, siquam iam *peperisse pudet*.

Prop. IV. 12. 20: . . . *pudor est non licuisse* mori.

Ov. Am. III. 11. 1. fg.: multa diuque tuli . . .  
et quae non *puduit ferre, tulisse pudet*.

<sup>1</sup> Madvig, Opusc. Acad. II. p. 119.

Ov. Her. IX. 59: non *puduit* fortis auro cohibere lacertos,  
et solidis gemmas *obposuisse* toris.

Here *cohibere* is used of an action still continuing; *obposuisse* of one already completed (cf. vs. 57).

Ov. Fas. I. 205: nec *pudor* in stipula placidam *cepisse* quietem  
et foenum capiti *subposuisse* fuit.

Ov. Fas. III. 282: et cum ciue *pudet* *conseruisse* manus.

Ov. Fas. IV. 367: 'non *pudet* herbosum' dixi '*posuisse* moretum  
in dominae mensis.'

Ov. Fas. VI. 526: . . . et furiis in scelus *isse pudet*.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 165: femina procedit densissima crinibus emptis . . .  
*nec rubor est emisse* palam.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 768: ulteriora *pudet* *docuisse*.

Inasmuch as the poet proceeds to tell the *ulteriora*, the phrase seems to have an apologetic force like *pace dua dixisse uelim*.

With the forms of these expressions which have a future significance, the poets join the perfect infinitive with a conditional force, as is clear from Plaut. Trin. 347:—

. . . bene si amico feceris,  
ne pigeat fecisse: ut potius *pudeat*, si non *feceris*

The present infinitive in this construction would represent the future, the perfect infinitive the future perfect. Here, too, it was often found convenient, for metrical reasons, to use the perfect for the present, the excuse for which would be the slight distinction between future and future perfect, or, since the clauses are all prohibitions, an excuse might be found in the analogous construction with verbs of wishing in prohibitions.

Tib. I. 1. 29: nec tamen interdum *pudeat tenuisse* bidentes  
[A] aut stimulo tardos *increpuisse* boues.

Ov. Am. III. 14. 21: illic *nec* tunicam tibi *sit posuisse pudori*,  
[A] nec femori inpositum *sustinuisse* femur.

Ov. Ar. Am. II. 252 [A]: *nec* tibi *sit* seruos *demeruisse pudor*.

Ov. Tr. I. 1. 50 [A]: *nec* tibi *sit* lecto *displacuisse pudor*.

In the following two examples the perfect infinitive seems to have been used simply to avoid metrical difficulties, for in both cases it is closely joined with a present infinitive : —

Tib. I. 2. 93:                *stare nec ante fores puduit caraeue puellae*  
[A]                ancillam medio *detinuisse* foro.

Ov. Her. XV. 350 [A]: quaque *timere* libet, *pertinuisse pudet*.

What has been said about *pudere* is true also of *pigere*, but with the future forms of this verb the perfect infinitive is found even in prose. The example just quoted from Plautus, *si . . . feceris : ne pigeat fecisse*, shows that the infinitive has the force of a future perfect. Tac. Ann. I. 73: *haud pigebit referre* shows the present infinitive with the force of a future condition.

Quint. III. 1. 22: *non tamen post tot ac tantos auctores pigebit meam quibusdam locis posuisse sententiam*.

Verg. Aen. VII. 233: *nec Troiam Ausonios gremio excepisse pigebit*.

Tib. I. 6. 51:                *parcite, quam custodit Amor, uiolare puellam,*  
   *ne pigeat magno post didicisse malo.*

Tib. IV. 4. 3:                *crede mihi, propera : nec te iam, Phoebe, pigebit*  
   *formosae medicas adplicuisse manus.*

Ov. Med. fac. 47: *tempus erit, quo uos speculum uidisse pigebit*.

Ov. ex P. II. 6. 14: *nec pigeat mento subposuisse manum*.

Ov. Her. XII. 210: *et piget infido consuluisse uiro*.

In the poets of imperial times and once in a prose writer the perfect infinitive is joined with the verb *decere*, but in all these cases it can readily be shown that the perfect is used in its proper sense.

Plin. Ep. VI. 29. 11: *in posterum opto ut ea potissimum iubear, quae me deceat uel sponte fecisse*. (I desire to be bidden to do that which I ought to have done of my own accord.)

Ov. Am. III. 7. 81: *nec mora, desiluit tunica uelata soluta :*  
   *et decuit nudos proripuisse pedes.*

Vs. 81 contains the idea *proripuit pedes*; cf. the following example : —

Ov. Met. IV. 329: *Nais ab his tacuit, pueri rubor ora notauit :*  
   *nescit enim quid amor ; sed et erubuisse decebat.*

Juv. Sat. XI. 201:                    spectent iuvenes, quos clamor et audax  
   sponsio, quos cultae *deceat adsedis*se puellae.

This example may be explained in the same way as the two preceding ones, but here there is further to be observed that the present infinitive for metrical reasons cannot be used in hexameter verse.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 431:                    *ire solutis*  
   crinibus et fletus *non tenuisse deceat*.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 145: huic *deceat* inflatos laxe *iacuisse* capillos.

The expression *ire solutis crinibus*, when compared with the expression *laxe iacuisse capillos*, illustrates very forcibly what was said above about the condition or state represented in one case by the perfect and in another by the present tense; cf. p. 117.

Tib. I. 2. 27:                    quisquis amore tenetur, eat tutusque sacerque  
   qualibet: insidias *non timuisse deceat*.

Vs. 24 fg. show that there has been fear felt, and so our verse shows the perfect in its proper sense (it is not becoming to have feared).

Ov. Am. II. 17. 23: tu quoque me, mea lux, in quaslibet accipe leges:  
   te *deceat* medio iura *dedisse* toro.

A long and careful search for other instances of the so called aorist infinitive in prose writers, has led to the discovery of but a single example, and even this admits of a better explanation. Cic. de div. II. 73: tum igitur esset auspiciū, si modo esset ei (aui) liberum, se *ostendisse*. Madvig (Opusc. Acad. II. 122) says the words *se ostendisse* are not to be joined with the phrase *si ei liberum esset*, but rather with the words *auspiciū esset*, and both Baiter and Müller have accepted this view. By this explanation all difficulty is removed, and the perfect *ostendisse* has its proper force.

The classes of cases so far treated are those in which the freer use of the perfect infinitive can be seen to be an extension of its legitimate normal use, to express completed action. There are, however, in poetry uses of the perfect infinitive which cannot be accounted for by any of the explanations offered above. In many of these cases the infinitive seems to have lost all sense of time, and seems



simply to express the fundamental idea of the verb, so that it may easily be regarded as an aorist.

This use occurs most frequently in Horace and in such poets as imitated him, or themselves drew from Greek sources. Not infrequently, too, the use is found in connection with constructions which are foreign to the Latin language and which are ordinarily recognized as formed on Greek models. In many of these cases the metre will not admit the present infinitive of the verb, the perfect of which is thus used, and especially in Ovid and the elegiac poets the ease with which the perfect infinitive fitted into the pentameter furnished a temptation to use it too strong to be resisted.

A reasonable explanation of this phenomenon is, therefore, that it is a still farther extension of the use of the perfect infinitive, for metrical convenience, beyond what was legitimate, and this principle, once established, developed a laxer use of the perfect infinitive, which was not however a conscious imitation of the Greek aorist, but rather a matter of convenience, and which found its justification in the analogous construction of verbs, the present of which could not be used in elegiac verse.

The fact that the present and perfect infinitive are found side by side in this construction with no difference of meaning whatever, and even in indirect discourse, goes far to prove that we have to do, not with an *aorist*, but with a perfect used for a *present* tense.

In the following examples, roughly classified, all verses are designated which contain the perfect infinitive of a verb, the present infinitive of which offers metrical difficulties: —

#### I. Constructions formed on Greek models.

Hor. car. saec. 25 [B]: uosque *ueraces cecinisse* Parcae.

Pers. VI. 3: mire *opifex* . . . *intendisse*.

Pers. VI. 6: *egregius lusisse* senes.

Pers. VI. 76: ne sit *praestantior* alter  
Cappadocas rigida pingues *pauisse* catasta.

Pers. IV. 7 [B]: *fert animus* calidae *fecisse* silentia turbae  
maiestate manus.

Mart. VI. 52. 3: uix tangente uagos ferro *resecare* capillos  
[B] *doctus* et hirsutas *excoluisse* genas.

Mart. IX. 101. 19:        saepe recusatos *parcus duxisse* triumphos  
   uictor Hyperboreo nomen ab orbe tulit.

## II. The infinitive depends on a verb.

Pers. I. 131:                nec qui abaco numeros et secto in puluere metas  
   *scit risisse* uafēr, multum gaudere paratus,  
   si cynico barbā petulans nonaria uellat.

The metre allows *ridere* without any other change.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 319: nec plectrum dextra, citharam *tenuisse* sinistra  
   *nesciat* arbitrio femina docta meo.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 455: *discite* ab alterius uestris *timuisse* querellis.

Pers. V. 33:                *permisit sparsisse* oculos iam candidus umbo.

Pers. II. 66:                haec baccam conchae *rasisse*, et stringere uenas  
   feruentis massae crudo de puluere *iussit*.

Ov. Tr. IV. 8. 51:        at uos *admoniti* nostris quoque casibus *este*,  
   [A]        aequantem superos *emeruisse* uirum.

Ov. Tr. III. 1. 79:        interea, quoniam statio mihi publica clausa est  
   [A]        priuato *liceat delituisse* loco.

Ov. Fas. IV. 131:        uere *monet* curuas materna per aequora puppes  
   ire, nec hibernas iam *timuisse* minas.

Mart. II. 1. 9:            te conuiua leget mixto quincunce, sed ante  
   *incipiat* positus quam *tepuisse* calix.

Mart. I. 55. 7:            cui *licet* exuiis nemoris rurisque beato  
   [A]        ante focum plenas *explicuisse* plagas  
   et piscem . . . ducere . . . et promere mella.

Mart. VI. 43. 7:        quondam laudatas quocunque *libebat* ad undas  
   [A]        currere nec longas *pertimuisse* uias.

Ov. Ar. Am. III. 525:    quis *uetat* a magnis ad res exempla minores  
   [A]        sumere, nec nomen *pertimuisse* ducis?

Ov. Ib. 11:                ille relegatum gelidos aquilonis ad ortus  
   [A]        non *sinit* exilio *delituisse* meo.

Ov. ex P. II. 2. 124 [C]: nec *licet* ante ipsos *procubuisse* deos.

Ov. Fas. VI. 230 [A]: non unguēs ferro *subsecuisse* *licet*.

## III. The infinitive is used substantively.

- Hor. Ep. I. 1. 41: uirtus est uitium fugere et *sapientia* prima  
stultitia *caruisse*.
- Pers. IV. 17: quae tibi *summa boni est*? uncta *uixisse* patella  
semper, et adsiduo curata cuticula sole?
- Ov. Am. II. 2. 28: quis minor est autem, quam *tacuisse*, labor?
- Ov. ex P. IV. 10. 82: quis labor est puram non *temerasse* fidem?
- Ov. Ar. Am. III. 370 [C]: maius opus mores *composuisse* suos.
- Ov. Ar. Am. I. 380 [A]: consilium tamen est *abstinuisse* meum.
- Mart. XIV. 135. 2 [C]: hoc opus est, pictis *accubuisse* toris.
- Ov. Ar. Am. II. 20 [C]: difficile est illis *imposuisse* modum.
- Ov. Rem. Am. 626 [A]: utile finitimis *abstinuisse* locis.
- Ov. ex P. III. 7. 35: est tamen utilius, studium cessare meorum,  
quam, quas admorint, non *ualuisse* preces.
- Ov. ex P. I. 3. 45: effice . . .  
talibus ut leuius sit *caruisse* malum.
- Mart. V. 25. 7: hoc, rogo, non melius, quam rubro pulpita nimbo  
[A] spargere et effuso *permaduisse* croco?
- Mart. VI. 2. 1: lusus erat sacrae conubia fallere taedae.  
[A] lusus et inmeritos *execuisse* mares.
- Mart. V. 19. 11: saturnaliae ligulam *misisse* selibrae  
. . . luxuria est.
- Mart. IX. 8. 1: tanquam parua foret sexus iniuria nostri  
[A] foedandos populo *prostituisse* mares.
- Ov. Ar. Am. I. 733: nec turpe putaris  
[C] palliolum nitidis *imposuisse* comis.
- Ov. Ar. Am. II. 215: nec tibi turpe puta . . . quamuis sit turpe, placebit . . .  
[A] ingenua speculum *sustinuisse* manu.
- Ov. ex P. II. 6. 19: turpe erit in miseris ueteri tibi rebus amico  
auxilium nulla parte *tulisse* tuum:  
turpe referre pedem, nec passu stare tenaci:  
[B] turpe laborantem *deseruisse* ratem.
- Ov. Am. I. 10. 41: turpe, tori reditu census augere paternos,  
[A] et faciem lucro *prostituisse* suam.

In these last two examples the perfect infinitives might be regarded as having their proper force of completed action were it not for the present infinitives in the same construction. The same holds true for the following examples : —

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Mart. VI. 44. 1 :  | festiue credis te, Calliodore, iocari     |
| [A]                | et solum multo <i>permauisse</i> sale.    |
| Mart. XII. 82. 9 : | exiguos secto comentem dente capillos     |
| [C]                | dicet Achilleas <i>disposuisse</i> comas. |

Although both these examples are cases of indirect discourse, *iocari* and *comentem* show that the time of the infinitives is present, and not past. In this use, then, the Latin does not follow the Greek, for the aorist infinitive in indirect discourse should denote past time.

To recapitulate briefly the results of this investigation : in early Latin the perfect infinitive with its proper significance was made to depend on the verb *nolo* or *uolo* in prohibitions ; but since the verb of wishing contained the idea of futurity, the whole clause acquired the force of a future perfect expression. Later writers, and especially the poets, transferred this use to negative clauses, not prohibitive, containing verbs of wishing, and secondly to clauses containing verbs like *laboro*, *amo*, and *timeo*, “Verba der Willensrichtung.” Since these verbs contain the idea of futurity, the present infinitive joined with them has the force of a future, the perfect infinitive the force of a future perfect.

The tendency of the Latin writers to use the future perfect for the future, through an overstrained desire to be exact, led them in these clauses to use the perfect infinitive instead of the present. The poets, and especially the elegiac poets, took advantage of the opportunity thus offered and transferred the use to other constructions which did not contain a verb of wishing. The reasons for this were two : first, the present infinitive of a large number of verbs which they wished to use, on account of metrical difficulties could not be used in their verse, or could only be used under certain restrictions ; second, the perfect infinitive of these verbs was peculiarly adapted to the necessities of the last half of pentameter verse.

The infinitive in this use seemed to have the force of an aorist in-

finitive in Greek, and, in course of time, came to be used by the poets even where the metre admitted the use of the present infinitive.

No examples are found in prose which cannot be explained as regular uses of the perfect.

The ease with which the perfect infinitive could be used in the last half of the pentameter led to such constant use that it at times actually constitutes a blemish ; e.g. —

Tib. I. 8. 7-12 :

desine dissimulare : deus crudelius urit,  
quos uidet inuitos *succubuisse* sibi.  
quid tibi nunc molles prodest coluisse capillos  
saepeque mutatas *disposuisse* comas,  
quid fuco splendente genas ornare, quid ungues  
artificis docta *subsecuisse* manu?

Ov. Her. IX. 71 :

detrahat Antaeus duro redimicula collo,  
ne pigeat molli *succubuisse* uiro.  
inter Ioniacas calathum tenuisse puellas  
diceris, et dominae *pertimuisse* minas.  
non fugis, Alcide, uictricem mille laborum  
rasilibus calathis *imposuisse* manum?

In the fourteen distichs of this last poem, beginning with vs. 59, the pentasyllabic perfect infinitive occurs seven times in the last half of the pentameter.